

Rev D. Inglis

Rev J. Kemp.

"A REVIEW" REVIEWED.

THE Rev. A. F. Kemp, A. M., of Windsor, has published, first in the *Sarnia Observer*, and afterwards in a pamphlet, "A Review of the State and Progress of the Canada Presbyterian Church since the Union in 1864." The pamphlet has been very widely circulated throughout the Church, and beyond its limits. Its design is to show that since the Union the growth of the Church has been arrested, to point out the causes of decay, and to suggest the remedies. In reviewing this publication, no reference will be made to the personalities, which it unhappily contains, on the ground that the discussion of such subjects, in the columns of a newspaper, or the pages of a pamphlet, is contrary alike to good taste and to the good order of our Presbyterian Church government.

The alleged fact that there has been a sudden and marked arrest in the increase of the ministry, the membership and the revenue of the C. P. Church, Mr. Kemp attempts to prove by arguments resting on certain comparative tables, embracing the periods from 1855 to 1859, before the Union, and from 1862 to 1866, after it.

It may here be noted that he speaks throughout the pamphlet of the Presbyterian Church of Canada as the Free Church, and to avoid confusion this last name will be used in the reply.

The tables in reference to the ministry are as follows :

FREE CHURCH.		U. P. CHURCH.	
Ministers on the roll in 1855.....	104	Ministers on the roll in 1855.....	50
" " " 1859.....	143	" " " 1859.....	66
Increase in 4 years	39	Increase in 4 years.....	16
Average increase per annum.....	9.75	Average increase per annum	4
or 9.40 per cent.		or 8 per cent.	

The average annual increase for the two Churches will thus be 8.87 per cent.

CANADA PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.	
Ministers on the roll in 1862	231
" " 1866	248
Increase in four years	17
Average increase per annum.....	4.25
or 1.85 per cent.	

Mr. Kemp's argument, founded on these tables, is, that while "the two Churches before the Union increased at the average rate of 8.87 per cent. per annum, the C. P. Church increased by only 1.85." Again he states that "had the C. P. Church after the Union increased at the same rate as the two Churches before the Union, we should have had 80 additional ministers instead of 17."

This mode of dealing with statistics may be tested by applying it to the population of Upper Canada.

The following tables are taken from the Census Returns for 1851-'52 and 1861-'62:

In 1811 the population of Upper Canada was.....	77,000
In 1841 " " " "	465,357
Increase in thirty years	388,357
Average increase per annum.....	12,945
or 16.81 per cent.	

From 1841 the increase as represented by the decennial returns is as follows:

Population in Upper Canada in 1841.....	465,357
" " " 1851.....	952,004
Increase in ten years	486,647
Average increase per annum.....	48,664
or 10.46 per cent.	
Population in Upper Canada in 1851.....	952,004
" " " 1861.....	1,396,091
Increase in ten years	444,087
Average increase per annum.....	44,408
or 4.66 per cent.	

Thus, according to Mr. Kemp's mode of reasoning, while the population of Upper Canada increased at the average rate of 16.81 per cent. per annum, for thirty years, from 1811 to 1841, and at the average rate of 10.46 per cent. per annum for ten years, from 1841 to 1851, it increased only at the average rate of 4.66 per cent. per annum for the ten years ending in 1861; being a difference of 12.15 in favor of the first period, and of 5.80 in favor of the second period, as compared with the increase in the last decennial period. These are "notable facts," proving "a marked arrest" in the progress of the population of Canada West. Yet notwithstanding, Mr. Kemp's reasoning to the contrary, the population has actually increased from 465,357 in 1841, to 1,396,091 in 1861.

The same test may be applied to the increase of the ministers in the Church from the beginning of its history, as appears from the following tables:

FREE CHURCH.

Ministers on the roll in 1845.....	33	Ministers on the roll in 1849.....	60
" " " 1849.....	60	" " " 1853.....	87
Increase in four years	27	Increase in four years.....	27
Average increase per annum	6.75	Average increase per annum	6.75
or about 20 per cent.		or 11 per cent.	
Ministers on the roll in 1853.....	87	Ministers on the roll in 1857.....	124
" " " 1857.....	124	" " " 1861.....	158
Increase in four years.....	37	Increase in four years.....	34
Average increase per annum	9.25	Average increase per annum	8.50
or 10½ per cent.		or nearly 7 per cent.	

It must be borne in mind that the years from 1853 to 1857 were years of unusual prosperity in the country, and in which there were an unusually large number of settlements; yet even this period is no exception to the general rule, that there is a gradual decrease in the percentage for each period of four years, the difference

1851-'52 and

77,000
465,357388,357
12,945

is as follows :

465,357
952,004486,647
48,664952,004
396,091444,087
44,408

population of
per annum, for
cent, per annum
rate of 4.66 per
cent of 12.15 in
d, as compared
ble facts," prov-
da West. Yet
population has

in the Church
tables :

1849..... 60

1853..... 87

..... 27

num 6.75

1857..... 124

1861..... 158

..... 34

num 8.50

years of unusual
large number of
rule, that there
s, the difference

between the first four and the last being 13 per cent. So that according to Mr. Kemp's mode of argument the arrest in the Church's progress took place at a much earlier period than he assigns to it.

Similar results appear when we take the statistics of the U. P. Church, or any other Church in the country. Mr. Kemp has argued throughout as though he were warranted to expect, not an arithmetical, but a kind of geometrical progression in the increase of the ministry. Every one acquainted with statistics knows that neither in the population of the country, nor in the membership of congregations can progress in such a proportion be expected. It can only take place in very exceptional circumstances, and cannot be maintained for any length of time. The argument is therefore a fallacy; it appears to carry conviction, and to settle the question in hand, but a little consideration will show that it is unsound and unfair. Yet it is used by Mr. Kemp throughout the pamphlet, and applied not only to the ministry, but also to the membership and the revenue of the Church.

There still, however, remains the fact, that the increase of the number of ministers for the last four years has only been 17, while there was an actual increase of 55 in the two Churches in the four years from 1855 to 1859. Before seeking for other causes, the statistics themselves should be carefully examined. Mr. Kemp affords no assistance in this inquiry. His statements in reference to the demissions, licenses, receptions, ordinations, translations, &c., are confused, contradictory and incorrect. Of demissions in the two Churches he gives 44 in the period before the Union, and 32 in the C. P. Church since the Union. Of receptions 21 in the former, and 12 in the latter. "Of ordinations, translations and inductions classed under the general head of settlements in all in the two Churches before the Union 116, and in the C. P. after the Union only 98." He also notices the increased mortality since the Union, 15 as against 5 in the two Churches in the four years before Union. Even if these statements had been correct, it would have been difficult to draw any accurate conclusions from them. There is obvious confusion caused by ranking translations in the same list with ordinations and inductions, a translation being simply a removal from one charge to another, causing a vacancy in the charge which the minister leaves to balance the settlement made. The discrepancies in Mr. Kemp's statements ought to have led him to a more careful examination of his figures. The actual facts are these:—There were added to the roll of the Free Church between 1855 and 1859, the names of 59 ministers, of whom 26 were Canadian licentiates, including one who finished his course in Scotland, but was licensed by a Canadian Presbytery, 33 were received from other Churches; 22 came from Scotland, 8 from Ireland, and 1 from England, and 2 from other Churches in Canada; but of these 59, 5 were removed by death and otherwise before 1859, all of whom were received from abroad, leaving 54 names on the roll at that date, which were not there in 1855. In the U. P. Church during the same period the names of 27 ministers were added, of whom 7 were Canadian licentiates, and 20 came from Scotland; but of these 27, 3 were removed from the roll before 1859, all of whom were from Scotland, leaving 24 ministers on the roll at that date who were not there in 1855. Excluding those who had been removed before the close of the period, this gives us 78 as the actual number added, of whom 33 were Canadian licentiates, and 45 were received from other Churches. Compare this with Mr. Kemp's figures: he gives 21 as the number received in the two Churches, when in reality, there were 53 receptions, and of these 45 were still on the roll in 1859. The Canadian licentiates ordained during the same period in the two Churches were 33. Thus it will be seen that of the 55 additional names on the rolls of the two Churches in 1859, 45 were received from other Churches. The ordination of Canadian licentiates, after making up for deaths, demissions, &c., only added ten to the number of ministers.

Taking up the second period we find that 52 names were added to the roll

from 1862 to 1866, and still found on it at the last date. Of these 9 were received from Scotland, 4 from the United States, 1 from Nova Scotia, 1 was received from the Roman Catholic Church, 3 were ministers who formerly held charges in Canada, and were inducted over new congregations, and 34 were Canadian licentiates who had received their education in whole or in part in this country. To these we may add 6 who were settled and removed during the period, making the whole number of settlements 58.

It is unnecessary to point out the difference between these facts and Mr. Kemp's figures. It is, however, important to notice that the proportion which the ministers received from other Churches, and settled between 1855 and 1859, and found on the roll at the close of the period (45) bears to the whole ministry at the beginning of the period (154) is 29 per cent. But the proportion of the same class during the latter period (14) to the whole ministry at the beginning of that period (231) is not quite 6½ per cent.

It is unnecessary to say more than that the decrease is due to the fact that we have received fewer ministers from other Churches in the latter period than in the former. The reasons for this decrease in the number who came to us from Europe are well known to all who have given the least attention to the subject. Formerly the U. P. Church of Scotland paid the passage money and outfit of preachers and ministers coming to this country, besides guaranteeing to each minister \$500 per annum for three years. Through the liberality of Joseph McKay, Esq., of Montreal, a large number of licentiates of the Free Church were brought to this country about the beginning of Mr. Kemp's first period, and unusually large accessions were made to that branch of the Church.

Again, the Churches in Scotland and Ireland had at that time more preachers than they could find employment for; now their supply, like our own, is inadequate to their wants. It was evident long before the Union took place that, whether it was effected or not, the supply of preachers from the mother Churches must gradually decrease, and that the Church must look more and more to a ministry trained in the country.

Mr. Kemp seems to have considered the changes which have taken place in the Church without reference to the actual bearing of these changes upon the progress or decline of the Church. Thus in reckoning the demissions he seems to have grouped together those who demitted part of their charges with a view to the settlement of a new minister, and even those who demitted with a view to translation, with those who demitted their whole charges without being under call to another congregation. The following tables will show the actual changes that took place during the two periods.

FIRST PERIOD.

Ministers on the rolls in 1855.....	154
Added from 1855 to 1859	86
On the rolls in 1859.....	209

Had there been no removals during this period there would have been 240 on the rolls in 1859, showing that 31 were actually removed, but of these 5 were by death, leaving 26 as the number removed by demissions and the discipline of the Church.

SECOND PERIOD.

Ministers on the roll in 1862	231
Added from 1862 to 1866.....	58
On the roll in 1866.....	243

Here again had there been no removals, there would have been 289 ministers on the roll in 1866, the number actually removed being 41, of whom 15 were by death, leaving 26, the same as in the former period as the number removed by demissions and discipline. But the number in the last period is greatly less in proportion to the whole number of the ministers.

There are other inaccuracies in Mr. Kemp's figures as regards the ministry; but it is surely enough to have shown on this head that his reasoning is fallacious, and his computations inaccurate, and that the causes of the decline in the numbers added to the ministry is to be found simply in the diminution of the number of ministers received from the Churches in Britain.

Instead of taking two different periods, it may be well to compare the progress of our Church with that of another Church in Canada, in which no Union has taken place, and in which no changes have been made in the mode of conducting missionary operations. In the list of ministers connected with the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church superannuated ministers and preachers are included, differing in this respect from our rolls, but taking that list with these included, we have the following result:

Ministers on the Alphabetical List, in 1862	504
" " 1866	525

Increase in four years.....	21
-----------------------------	----

Average annual increase, 5.25. Or, about one per cent.

We thus find that the Methodist Church has only increased by four more than our own during the same period—the per-centage, owing to the larger number of ministers being a good deal less.

Mr. Kemp's tables in reference to the membership are as follows:

FREE CHURCH.		U. P. CHURCH.	
Members reported in 1855.....	11,191	Members reported in 1855.....	6,288
" " 1859.....	16,485	" " 1859.....	9,293
Increase in four years.....	5,294	Increase in 4 years.....	3,005
Average annual increase ...	1,323	Average annual increase ...	754
Or, 12 per cent.		Or, 12 per cent.	

C. P. CHURCH.	
Members reported in 1862.	30,256
" " 1866.	36,469
Increase in 4 years.	6,213
Average annual increase	1,553
Or, 5 per cent.	

For reasons already fully stated the percentage argument is wholly worthless. Again however, there is an actual decrease in the members added in the last period as compared with the first. In the two churches in the first period the increase was 8,299, against 6,213 in the C. P. Church during the last period. But the statistics on this point, as Mr. Kemp admits, are incomplete. As an illustration of this, we may state that the membership reported in the U. P. Church is actually greater in 1854 than it is in 1855. We must, however, deal with the statistics as we find them.

In the first period there were 55 added to the number of ministers, and only 17 in the second period. For every minister added during the first period there were nearly 151 added to the membership; but for every additional minister in the second period there were 365 additional members, a difference of 214 in favor of the Church since the Union. There is another way in which the relation of the membership to the ministry may be brought out. In 1855 there were in the two churches 154 ministers and 17,479 members, which gives 113 members to each minister; but in 1859 there were 123 members to each minister; and in the C. P. Church in 1862, there

Since the above was written an able address by the Rev. J. M. King, delivered in Cook's Church, Toronto, has been published in the *Globe*, and it not only confirms what has been said, but also adds the following important information in reference to immigration, derived from sources to which the writer had not access :

“There is reason to believe that the number of emigrants actually settling in Canada during the first period was greater than that during the latter. Here again we must take exception to Mr. Kemp's statistics. According to these, the accessions to our population from Scotland was, in the four years from 1855 to 1859 (i.e., for 1856, '57, '58 and '59), 8,229; and in the four years from 1861 to 1865, 12,453. But how many of the emigrants reaching Canada by Quebec (and it is to such only that the figures refer) in 1859 could have had a place in the returns of membership which close with the 31st April of that year? Is the St. Lawrence even open at that period? If there is to be any fairness in the comparison, we must take the immigration into Canada from Scotland for the four years closing December, 1858, and December, 1865, respectively. In the one period, 12,295; in the other, 12,453. The numbers, it will thus be seen, are nearly equal; but most acquainted with the state of the Province will admit the probability of there being a larger proportion of them actual settlers in the former period than in the latter. But if we would trace in any satisfactory way the influence of immigration on the accessions to the Church in these periods of four years, we must include the immigration of several years prior to each of the periods. Emigrants going to settle on new land, as so many did in the counties of Huron, Grey and Bruce, between 1852 and 1859, are not generally received into membership the first or second year after entering Canada. It is often, as every one who has had to do with missionary work in the west, knows, three and four years before a congregation is organized in the locality where he begins to clear his farm and make a home for himself and his family. Now, taking the seven years closing with Dec., 1858, and the seven years closing with December, 1865, we find that the immigration into Canada from Scotland by the port of Quebec was in the former period (a large proportion of them actual settlers) 28,963; in the latter only 15,337. Putting these considerations together, it is ground alike for surprise and gratitude that the increase in the membership of the Church was so large, viz., 6,213.”

The following table will show the progress of the Wesleyan Church, in membership, as compared with that of the C. P. Church, from 1862 to 1866:

Members of the Wesleyan Church in full communion, 1862.....	50,341
" " " " 1866.....	53,934

Increase in four years.....	3.593
-----------------------------	-------

Thus while the 50,341 members of the Wesleyan Church have increased by 3,593, the 30,256 members of the C. P. Church have increased by 6,213. The Wesleyan Church has been selected because of its Christian zeal and activity, with a view of showing the unfairness of taking the two periods which Mr. Kemp has chosen, and comparing the statistics of the Church during these periods that are indeed of equal length, yet in all other respects most unequal. No church in Canada has made more rapid and steady progress than the Wesleyan, and yet it, as well as the C. P. Church, has felt the effects of the withdrawal of a large portion of the population to the United States, owing to the general depression of the trade of the Province.

It is a gratifying fact that there was an increase in the decennial period from 1851 to 1861, in the membership of both churches, much greater than the proportionate increase in the population.

In the department of finance Mr. Kemp confines his attention to the Stipend Fund. The tables are as follows:

FREE CHURCH.		U. P. CHURCH.	
Stipend account, 1855	\$45,878	Stipend account, 1855	\$20,553
" " 1859	\$64,857	" " 1859	\$31,215
Increase in four years.....	\$18,979	Increase in four years.....	\$10,662
Average annual increase	\$ 4,745	Average annual increase.....	\$ 2,665

C. P. CHURCH.	
Stipend account, 1862	\$101,599
" " 1866	\$129,711
Increase in four years	\$28,112
Average annual increase.....	\$ 7,028

This is the most glaring instance of Mr. Kemp's carelessness, or rather recklessness, in dealing with statistics. The Free Church and the C. P. Church have sometimes given two columns to the stipend account, and at others only one. In the former case one column marks the stipend promised, and the other the stipend actually paid. But when there is only one column for stipend in the statistics, it invariably contains the amount actually paid. In 1855 there was only one column, the amount paid; in 1859 there were two, *the amount promised being larger than the amount paid*, and Mr. Kemp, instead of taking the amounts actually paid in both instances, takes in 1859, the larger amount which was promised and not paid. Again in 1862, there is only the one column for the amount paid, but in 1866 there are two, in this instance *the amount paid being greater than the amount promised*, and again he takes the amount promised, it being smaller than the amount actually paid. The difference in the first instance is \$9,289, so that instead of an increase of \$18,979, we get only \$9,690, as the increase for that period in the Free Church. In the second instance, the difference is \$4,029, so that the increase in the C. P. for the last four years, instead of being \$28,112, is in reality \$32,141.

Of course Mr. Kemp's reasonings on such figures as he uses are utterly worthless. The actual increase in stipend paid in the two Churches from 1855 to 1859 was \$20,372, that of the C. P. Church from 1862 to 1866, \$32,141. So that while the increase in ministers during the first period in the two Churches was 55, the increase in stipend paid was only \$20,372, or about \$368 for each additional minister; the increase in the ministers of the C. P. Church for the last four years was only 17, and the increase in stipend paid was \$32,141, or \$1,890 for each additional minister. Spreading this increase over the whole Church, in 1859 the whole sum paid for stipend was \$86,783, which, divided among the 209 ministers in the two Churches gives an average stipend of \$415. The sum paid for stipend in 1866 was \$133,740, which sum, divided among the 248 ministers in the C. P. Church, gives an average stipend of over \$539 for each minister, an increase of \$124. Mr. Kemp presents the averages towards the close of his pamphlet with very different results, but over and above the blunder in taking the wrong column, his whole mode of dealing with statistics is of such a nature that instead of illustrating and confirming, they only distract and confuse.

It is not worth while to take up Mr. Kemp's statements in reference to the average contributions to the stipend fund for each member. Where his figures are so inaccurate his results must be worthless.

We bring this examination of Mr. Kemp's statistics to a close with an extract from the Report of the Committee on Statistics presented to the Synod in June, 1866.

members to
bers to the
1855. Yet
cent. since
ion between
rch.
delivered in
nly confirms
reference to

g in Canada
in we must
ions to our
or 1856, '57,
thow many
the figures
a close with
d? If there
into Canada
mber, 1865,
nbers, it will
the Province
al settlers in
factory way
riods of four
the periods.
a of Huron,
membership
who has had
efore a con-
and make a
g with Dec.,
immigration
riod (a large
utting these
the increase

membership,

50,341
53,934
3,593

ed by 3,593,
ne Wesleyan
th a view of
chosen, and
eed of equal
made more
J. P. Church,
o the United

d from 1851
proportionate

"The improved financial state of the Church, as indicated by the Returns, calls for special thanks to the Father of lights, from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift."

"The liberality of the people having been stimulated by the great material prosperity of the country, the contributions for religious objects have been so largely increased, that the gross aggregate amount, on the face of the Returns, nearly reaches \$275,000. There are even ample grounds for concluding that with full Reports from each congregation, the whole amount would exceed \$300,000—the largest sum ever raised by our Church,—and plainly indicating the growth of more generous and liberal feelings, throughout the bounds of our Zion. The Returns, when compared and examined, shew an average contribution from each communicant of \$7 50, being the largest ever reached by us, and putting us in this respect, in advance of the Churches in this land or in the old country."

"As might have been expected, the improved material condition of the land has more or less benefitted the various Synodical schemes. But, while not overlooking them, it is gratifying to find that the most important financial branch—the Stipend Fund, has been most liberally dealt with, and exhibits an increase of over \$20,000. At the same time, general congregational interests have not been neglected, from the fact of the contributions for Church purposes shewing an augmentation of more than \$10,000. Using round numbers the College Fund presents an increase of about \$60., the Home Mission of about \$3,000, the Foreign Mission of more than \$700, and the Synodical of about \$40., while the gross contributions from all sources exceed those of last year by nearly \$50,000."

Mr. Kemp again and again states that the two periods present equal facilities for the progress of the Church. This only proves his ignorance of the state of matters in Upper Canada. The first three years of Mr. Kemp's first period were years of unexampled prosperity in the country. The first really bad harvest was in 1859, and it was not until 1860 that the effects of the commercial depression were fully felt. The years 1862, '63, '64 and '65 were the very worst years. Hundreds of mechanics were leaving our cities and villages to seek employment in the United States, and it is only within the last year that there have been signs of returning prosperity, of which we have ample evidence in the improved financial condition of the Church.

It would have been instructive to have compared our financial condition with that of the Wesleyan Church, but their financial statistics are so differently arranged that to any one not intimately acquainted with both systems it is impossible to do it satisfactorily. The writer has been impressed with the remarkable liberality of the members of this Church, especially in the support of their missions. Probably, in this respect, they occupy a higher position than any other religious denomination in the land, and their example should excite us to greater zeal.

As Mr. Kemp's arguments, designed to prove that the Church is in a state of decay, have been shewn to be unsound, it might seem to be unnecessary to follow him into that part of his pamphlet in which he discusses the causes of the alleged decay. But the statements themselves are so contrary to the facts of the case and so much calculated to do harm, especially beyond the limits of the Church, that it becomes necessary to reply to them also.

The first point which demands attention is the union of the two Churches. Mr. Kemp speaks of the union as though it had wrought evil in the Church, and quotes the old classical proverb that the half sometimes exceeds the whole. He represents the united Church as "without a past, stript of all generous enthusiasm, having no history, no contendings, no martyrs, no heroes, no special principles to represent." This will never do. It is the sheerest nonsense. If the Church has no principles to represent, the sooner it ceases to exist the better. We have a history,—our noblest history common to us all, running far back beyond either the Secession or the Disruption. The principles embodied in our Scriptural standards are as dear to us as ever. The Union itself is a great fact in our history. Many who feared the effects of it have

Returns, calls
on every good

great material
have been so
of the Returns,
ding that with
ed \$300,000—
the growth of
ur Zion. The
ion from each
putting us in
country."

n of the land
while not over-
acial branch—
an increase of
have not been
s shewing an
College Fund
0, the Foreign
the gross con-
000."

facilities for the
matters in Upper
of unexampled
it was not until
the years 1862,
were leaving our
only within the
we have ample

dition with that
y arranged that
le to do it satis-
fily of the mem-
robably, in this
mination in the

s in a state of
necessary to follow
of the alleged
of the case and
Church, that it

Churches. Mr.
arch, and quotes
He represents
s to represent."

no principles to
ry,—our noblest
n or the Disrup-
ar to us as ever.
effects of it have

been happily disappointed, and Mr. Kemp, who was one of the most impatient advocates of the measure, is the first who has printed a word of regret in reference to it. It is deeply to be lamented that he has allowed himself to utter sentiments calculated to arouse prejudices and to give rise to misconceptions. Here it can do little harm, but at a time when the subject of union occupies so much attention in the Presbyterian Churches throughout the world, his statements are most mischievous in their tendency. It is a matter of surprise that there has been such entire harmony in the United Church, and that so much has been done to consolidate the Church. It may be granted to Mr. Kemp that we have not received so many ministers from Britain as we might have done had we remained apart, but the Union itself is most harmonious, and its good results in the consolidation of the Church are more and more apparent from year to year.

Mr. Kemp deals very severely with the Central Fund, and the Home Mission Committee who manage it. He seems ignorant alike of the past history of the Home Mission operations, and the working of the present system. He speaks as though the Free Church had all along left the mission work to the Presbyteries, with the exception of the distribution of the missionaries. In 1844, a Home Mission Committee was appointed, the late Rev. A. Gale, Convenor. From the first this Committee exercised a general supervision of the whole field, and the legislation of the Synod from year to year tended more and more to centralisation. In 1847, a Central Synodical Fund was instituted, and the regulations for the Home Mission work were very similar to those by which our present Committee is guided. In 1848 the Committee were even authorised to determine the stationing of ministers after corresponding with Presbyteries.* In 1853 Mr. Gale was appointed Superintendent of Home Missions, with a salary. It was not till 1855, after Mr. Gale's death, that the work of the Synod's H. M. Committee, was reduced to the mere distribution of missionaries among the Presbyteries. In 1857, the Presbytery of Montreal overtook the Synod for the re-establishment of a Central Fund, and it was sent down to Presbyteries, but in view of the negotiations for union no action was taken. Immediately after the Union the subject of the Home Mission work occupied the attention of the Synod, and from the very first the Synod approved of a Central Fund. In 1864 a proposal was made to conduct it by Presbyteries, and in 1865 mission districts were proposed, but the Synod continued by overwhelming majorities to adhere to the principle of a Central Fund, and at length the present scheme being matured, the Synod in 1865 instituted that Fund, and appointed a committee to manage it. This history of the scheme will serve to correct some of Mr. Kemp's misstatements.

We come now to the comparative results of the two schemes. When the present Committee began operations, it found the Presbyteries, with scarcely an exception, deeply in debt:—Montreal, \$1500; London (including debt on Buxton Mission) \$1667; Toronto, \$300; Grey, \$350; Ottawa, \$321; Cobourg, \$100; Ontario, \$89; Kingston, \$91, together with other debts not included in these sums, amounting in all to upwards of \$5000. Missionaries were wearied out waiting for years for the payment of arrears due to them. This is the scheme under which Mr. Kemp speaks of the Church as flourishing. To the Central Committee Mr. Kemp traces in a large measure his alleged decay of the Church, and yet it had only been in operation one year up to the time when his statistics end. Surely it had nothing to do with the want of progress during the preceding three years. Since it has been in operation it has paid off \$4,000 of old debts, (Montreal Presbytery liquidating its own arrears,) besides meeting punctually all the current expenses of the mission work. Such facts outweigh a score of such pamphlets as the one under review.

Mr. Kemp accuses the Home Mission scheme of being "cumbrous," requiring elaborate statistics, "taking the best men of the Church from their own proper work, and making them collectors of statistics," &c., &c. What can be said to such assertions, save that Mr. Kemp evidently knows nothing about the scheme,

*Mr. Kemp's Digest.

All that is required of Presbyteries is that they send to the Committee, once a year, the very statistics which they must have for their own guidance, unless they carry on their work at hap-hazard. He objects that the large Presbyteries of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and London have been cut in pieces in such a way that the strong parts had little or no mission field, and the weak and feeble had the whole outlying work to themselves. With the exception of Hamilton, all these Presbyteries have a larger Mission field than they can overtake. Montreal has an immense territory with twenty-five mission stations; Toronto has also an extensive territory with the same number of stations; and London extends over five counties, and has nineteen mission stations. The Presbyteries in respect to the number of ministers are larger than before the union, and surely in extent of territory they are large enough to satisfy even Mr. Kemp. No arrangement could be made by which the weaker portions of the church would not have the most necessitous fields. This has been the case all along, and hence the necessity of a Central fund.

Mr. Kemp complains that Presbyteries are deprived of their legitimate work, that the scheme keeps the Presbyteries in ignorance of the actual wants within their bounds, and that they cannot project new missions. These statements may all be simply contradicted. The regulations of the Synod make it imperative on Presbyteries to keep up a minute acquaintance with all the facts connected with their mission stations and weak congregations. Every encouragement is given to Presbyteries to project new missions and to carry them on with efficiency, without involving themselves in the penalties of debt. In a word, Mr. Kemp writes in ignorance of the whole scheme. He has been viewing the subject at a distance, "through the loop-holes of retreat," and has fallen into the most astounding mistakes.

One other statement must be corrected. Mr. Kemp says the Synod has shewn opposition to the institution of a new College in the eastern part of the Province, where it is earnestly desired and greatly needed. This is not true. The subject of a new College at Montreal was brought before the Synod by overture in 1864, and the resolution of the Synod was: "That the Synod sanction the formation of a Theological College, as overtured by the Presbytery of Montreal, and that for this purpose the Presbytery of Montreal be authorized to prepare a Charter, *mutatis mutandis*, similar to that of Knox's College, and to report to next Synod." The only amendment to this motion was one approving the object but preferring to send the overture down to Presbyteries. The Synod, by a large majority, decided in terms of the motion. In 1865 the Charter was completed, and it was remitted to the Presbytery of Montreal to mature arrangements. In 1866 the Synod expressed satisfaction with the progress made, and it was again remitted to the Presbytery of Montreal to prosecute and mature the scheme. If this is what Mr. Kemp calls "shewing opposition to a scheme," surely he uses words in the very opposite sense from that in which they are usually understood.

In regard to Knox College it is only necessary to recall attention to the fact that the small increase in the number of ministers is not due to the falling off of the Canadian licentiates, and to add that the senior class who are now finishing their studies consists of 14 students, the largest number we have had in any year except 1858-9. The following numbers will shew how many have finished the course of study since 1856-7. The first number refers to the Senior class of 1856-7, and the others to the following years in their order:—7, 5, 17, 5, 3, 6, 11, 9, 8, 11, 14. There are in all this session 23 Theological students. There are a large number of students studying in the Toronto University and other Colleges with a view to the ministry of our Church, exceeding the number at any previous period in our history.

The only one of Mr. Kemp's remedies which it is necessary to examine in detail is his proposal in regard to Home Missions. He proposes "to organize three or four District Synods, and intrust the Mission work to them." Does Mr.

mittee, once a
aidance, unless
a Presbyteries
ces in such a
weak and feeble
of Hamilton,
ertake. Mon-
bronto has also
ondon extends
Presbyteries in
on, and surely
r. Kemp. No
urch would not
ng, and hence

igitinate work,
l wants within
statements may
imperative on
connected with
ment is given
with efficiency,
ord, Mr. Kemp
the subject at
into the most

ynod has shewn
of the Province,
rue. The sub-
by overture in
tion the forma-
ntreal, and that
pare a Charter,
to next Synod."
but preferring
large majority,
ted, and it was
In 1866 the
again remitted
me. If this is
e uses words in
stood.

on to the fact
the falling off of
now finishing
we had in any
have finished
Senior class of
17, 5, 3, 6, 11,
a. There are a
other Colleges
at any previous

to examine in
"to organize
ern." Does Mr.

Kemp mean that these Synods are to carry on the Home Missior operations without reference to Presbyteries? Then indeed will the Mission work be taken out of the hands of Presbyteries with a vengeance. If the Synods are to operate through the Presbyteries then we have three or four central committees instead of one,—each Presbytery sending up "elaborate statistics" to the Synod under which it is placed, and each Synod sending up these statistics again to the General Assembly. Here we have "machinery, complicated and heavy machinery." If the present machinery is as Mr. Kemp alleges, complicated, cumbersome and difficult, then his proposed plan will increase these evils four or five fold.

Mr. Kemp's scheme would still throw the heaviest burden of the Mission work on those least able to bear it, and cut off the feeblar Synods from the resources of those who are more numerous and wealthy. The Synod has already decided very emphatically against Mission Districts, and the Church is perfectly satisfied with the results of the Central Committee's operations so far as they have yet gone. Were the Synod to adopt Mr. K.'s scheme, it would cripple the energies of the Church and arrest its progress.

This perhaps is the proper place to notice that Mr. Kemp evidently confounds the Home Mission Committee, with the Committee for the distribution of Preachers. They are entirely distinct. It may perhaps be suggested here that a change is desirable in the mode of distributing probationers, and that it would be well that they should be sent to the Presbyteries for longer periods, and that care should be taken not to put them to unnecessary travel and expense. This, however, has nothing whatever to do with the Home Mission operations.

It is impossible to say of Mr. Kemp's pamphlet that the half is greater than the whole. The whole is mischievous in its tendency, incorrect in its statements, fallacious in its reasonings, and unsound in its conclusions. It is surprising that a man of his practical sagacity failed to see that there is a mistake in almost every paragraph he has written.

The Church would have welcomed his pamphlet, had he dealt with the all important question of the insufficient supply of ministers and missionaries. Unhappily it is calculated both to prevent probationers from coming to us from the parent Churches, and to deter our own young men from studying for the ministry of the Church. There were by last returns 48 vacancies and only 11 probationers. There are 132 Mission Stations connected with our Home Mission operations, and our supply of laborers for this field is even more inadequate than in the case of the vacancies. All branches of the Church of Christ in Britain, endowed and unendowed, are constrained to acknowledge that one of the great barriers to their progress is the want of ministers. The Presbyteries in Scotland are earnestly discussing remedial measures. It is imperatively demanded of the Church here to take decisive steps with a view of increasing the number of candidates for the ministry. It has already occupied the attention of our Church Courts, but more united, earnest effort is required. Ministers should seek out pious and talented young men in their congregations, and encourage them to go on to the work of the ministry; parents should gladly devote their most pious and talented sons to the same noble work; and encouragement should be given to deserving young men, by increasing the number of bursaries. It is pleasant to agree with Mr. Kemp in one point, where he urges the people to greater liberality in the matter of stipend. The social status of ministers must be raised by increasing the average emolument. Nor must the higher motives to the ministry be lost sight of. Let a strong tide of living piety roll in upon the Church, and in spite of all discouragements, our young men will be found devoting themselves to the noblest work in which men can engage. Our ministers and people must be stirred up to more earnest prayer that the Lord would send forth laborers into His harvest.

DAVID INGLIS.

Hamilton, March 5th, 1867.